



REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE (RFA) FORM INTAKE INTERVIEW LOG

<u>Date:</u> 2/28/18	<u>Interviewer:</u> Lafayette Baker	RFA #18 – 22
<u>Name of Person(s) Requesting Assistance:</u> [REDACTED]		
<u>Contact Numbers (telephone, e-mail, etc.):</u> [REDACTED]		
<u>Status of Person(s) Interviewed (title, position, student status, etc.):</u> Student		
<u>Requested Assistance Pertaining To (name, position, policy, project, etc.):</u> Dr. [REDACTED], Professor, [REDACTED]		

To the best of your knowledge, please fill out the following:

Interviewee Status: Male ☐ Female ☐ Administrator ☐ Faculty ☐ Staff ☐ Student x
 Concern Regarding: Male ☐ Female x Administrator ☐ Faculty x Staff ☐ Student ☐

Category: *(Please check at least one)*

- | | | | | |
|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Age | <input type="checkbox"/> Color | <input type="checkbox"/> Creed | <input type="checkbox"/> Disability | <input type="checkbox"/> Veteran Status |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Marital Status | <input type="checkbox"/> National Origin | <input type="checkbox"/> Race | <input type="checkbox"/> Religion | <input type="checkbox"/> Retaliation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sex/Gender | <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual Harassment | <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual Orientation | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment | <input type="checkbox"/> Genetic Information |
- x Gender Identity or Expression

Time Line		
Date	Item	Comments
2/28/18	LB met with [REDACTED]	<p>LB explains the EO Office Resolution processes, “Protocol,” including differences between the informal resolution process and filing a formal discrimination complaint. LB also discusses the EO Office’s limits on confidentiality (including the Public Records Act) and the prohibition against retaliation, as well as resources and reporting options [REDACTED] indicated they did not want to file a formal complaint and that they wanted an informal resolution.</p> <p>[REDACTED] told LB that this incident happened in their [REDACTED] class with Dr. [REDACTED] on 2/13. She handed their essay back before class, and she wrote on their essay I can’t grade this because it does not have anything to do with the class.</p>

		<p>After class, [REDACTED] went to her office hours to talk to her about the comments she wrote on their essay. [REDACTED] explained to [REDACTED] that they did not write about the proper topic. In addition, she also told [REDACTED] they did not have a “voice” in the essay several times, and they did not have a position in essay.</p> <p>[REDACTED] explained to her that they had a position in the paper, and she explained to [REDACTED], that [REDACTED] was too invested in a particular type of discourse in the essay. She recommended a writer that [REDACTED] should read. [REDACTED] indicated to [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] is transgender, and [REDACTED] does not like that writer she recommended because [REDACTED] believes the writer is transphobic. [REDACTED] said Dr. [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] to open their mind regarding the writer.</p> <p>[REDACTED] explained to LB that it is offensive to tell a transgender person “they have no voice,” and they need to “open their mind.”</p> <p>[REDACTED] preferred outcome is for [REDACTED] to understand [REDACTED] concerns. [REDACTED] would like the EO Office to talk to [REDACTED].</p>
3/14/18	LB called [REDACTED]	<p>LB asked [REDACTED] if they would like LB to follow up with [REDACTED] now, or wait until grades are posted. [REDACTED] indicated that they would like to wait until after grades are posted.</p>
4/5/18	LB met with [REDACTED]	<p>LB explained the EO Office’s Resolution processes “Protocol” (see above).</p> <p>[REDACTED] indicated that she was very surprised about [REDACTED] concerns. She teaches her course within a theoretical framework. [REDACTED] paper was not at the level that she expected for the course. She could not grade it because the prompt he created did not address the course material properly.</p> <p>She offered for [REDACTED] to come and talk to her about the paper. When [REDACTED] came to her office, she was not aware of their gender identity. She gave [REDACTED] the option to rewrite the paper. She wanted to give them a chance. She said she did not understand their position in the paper. [REDACTED] was stringing a lot of quotations of particular scholars which is one-sided. She said an academic paper doesn’t just present one perspective, but shows a variety of different viewpoints.</p> <p>She said “having no voice” and “having an open mind,” have academic meanings. She uses the terms consistently academically. She explained that she had no intention to diminish [REDACTED]. She wanted to establish [REDACTED] critical position as the</p>

		author of the essay. She said she is very sensitive about this issue.
4/9/18	LB called and emailed [REDACTED]	LB attempted to schedule a follow-up meeting
4/11/18	LB called [REDACTED]	Set up a Friday 4/13 2pm follow-up meeting.
4/13/18	[REDACTED] emailed LB	[REDACTED] wanted to rescheduled their meeting
4/13/18	LB emailed [REDACTED]	The meeting was rescheduled for Wednesday 4/18 at 3:00pm
4/18/18	LB me with [REDACTED]	[REDACTED] thought it was helpful that they came in and talked to LB. And that LB followed up with [REDACTED]. They thought LB helped them accomplish their preferred outcome, and they are comfortable where this is currently.